

Appl. No. 09/428,836
Amdt. Dated May 10, 2004
Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81800.0011
Customer No.: 26021

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 9, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are made in response thereto. Claims 4-11 and 15-18 are presently pending in this application for consideration. It is not the Applicant's intent to surrender any equivalents because of the remarks made herein. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6, 7 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,982,994 to Mori et al. (hereinafter "Mori"). Claims 5 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,614,546 to Kurozasa.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references as required by 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103. Applicant further submits that none of the cited references whether considered alone or in combination discloses an arrangement of *a designation means for designating at least one client(s) or job(s) for at least one of the plurality of paper supply means such that one paper supply means is dedicated for one client or job* as recited in independent claims 4 and 8. Independent claim 15 recites a similar arrangement (*a means for dedicating at least one of said paper supplies for a print job of a particular client based on a request from said particular client*) which is not disclosed by the cited references whether considered alone or in combination. Thus, claims 4, 8 and 15 and all claims dependent directly or indirectly therefrom are allowable. These distinctions will be described in greater detail below.

THE CLAIMS DISTINGUISH OVER THE CITED REFERENCES

The present invention is directed to a network printer that performs printing based on printing requests received from network-connected clients. According to an embodiment of the present invention, a plurality of paper supply means are included. Independent claims 4 and 8 recite that the network printer also includes *a designation means for designating at least one client(s) or job(s) for at least one of the plurality of paper supply means such that one paper supply means is dedicated for one client or job*. As stated above, independent claim 15 recites similar language. According to the embodiment of the present invention, the network printer further includes a printing means for accepting only printing requests from the client(s) or for the job(s) designated by the designating means.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Mori nor the combination of Mori and Kurozasa discloses the claimed arrangements of (1) *a designation means for designating at least one client(s) or job(s) for at least one of the plurality of paper supply means such that one paper supply means is dedicated for one client or job* or (2) *a means for dedicating at least one of said paper supplies for a print job of a particular client based on a request from said particular client*.

In rejecting the claims, the Office Action takes the position that Mori discloses the designating means as the spooling controller 21-8. The Office Action points to column 16, lines 12-19 of Mori for providing a description of the spooling

controller 21-8. (See, Office Action at pages 3-6). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Mori is directed to a network printer apparatus and LAN network system. A high-speed network printer apparatus is used in common by clients having different communication protocols and which can sort out printing jobs into the order of clients. A communication protocol controller receives printing information in accordance with a predetermined protocol. A spooling controller, which is coupled to a storage unit which stores the received printing information, creates a queue for printing jobs. A printer controller reads out from the storage unit the printing information corresponding to a printing job of the highest priority which is designated by the queue. (See, Abstract, lines 1-16). According to the operation of the network printer apparatus, the spooling controller 21-8 receives the control file from the client and attaches the printing job header information, the name of the designated emulation, the name of the designated paper feed hopper, the instruction to print on both sides, etc. to the first bytes of the spool information stored in the hard disk by reference to the content of the control file. (See, col. 16, lines 12-19).

Mori, however, fails to disclose the claimed arrangement of *a designation means for designating at least one client(s) or job(s) for at least one of the plurality of paper supply means such that one paper supply means is dedicated for one client or job.* In other words, Mori fails to disclose designating a paper supply means for a particular client or job. Mori merely discloses a network printer where print jobs are performed according to the paper size and the priority given to the print job.

Appl. No. 09/428,836
Amdt. Dated May 10, 2004
Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81800.0011
Customer No.: 26021

Kurozasa is directed to an image processing system and image forming apparatus. Kurozasa fails to disclose the claimed arrangement of ***a designation means for designating at least one client(s) or job(s) for at least one of the plurality of paper supply means such that one paper supply means is dedicated for one client or job*** and was not cited for the purpose.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in the cited references that disclose, teach or suggest the above-identified arrangements recited in independent claims 4, 8 and 15. Since the cited references fail to disclose, teach or suggest all of the features recited in independent claims 4, 8 and 15, Applicant submits that the rejections of these claims set forth in the Office Action fail to meet the requirements for a showing of anticipation or obviousness. Thus, these claims are allowable. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103.

Applicant further submits that claims dependent from allowable claims 4, 8 and 15, namely claims 5-7, 9-11 and 16-18 are allowable by virtue of their dependence from allowable claims 4, 8 and 15 and for containing other patentable features. Applicant's silence as to the Examiner's comments is not indicative of being in acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

Appl. No. 09/428,836
Amdt. Dated May 10, 2004
Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81800.0011
Customer No.: 26021

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and requests early notice to that effect.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6700 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: May 10, 2004

By: 
Anthony J. Orler
Registration No. 41,232
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701